

I. U.S. Government Policy:	nent II. Labor Market III. Ethnic Reception: Community: None		Working Class	Entrepreneurial/ Professional	
Passive acceptance	Neutral or positive ^b	Argentines 92,563 30.9 \$35,000 11.3	Italians 580,592 8.6 \$29,369 8.0	Greeks 177,398 14.8 \$33,500 9.1	
rassive acceptance	Discriminatory ^c	Nigerians 55,350 64.2 \$25,500 13.6	Mexicans 4,298,014 3.5 \$21,926 29.7	Jamaicans 334,140 14.9 \$30,599 12.1	
Active support⁴	Neutral or positive ^b	Romanians 91,106 28.8 \$35,000 15.8	Polish 388,328 16.3 \$29,948 9.7	Cubans 736,971 15.6 \$27,292 14.7	
	Discriminatory ^e	Ethiopians 34,805 29.3 \$26,000 27.2	Laotians 171,577 5.1 \$19,671 40.3	Vietnamese 543,262 15.9 \$30,039 25.5	

Figure 3. Contexts of reception of recent immigrant groups in the United States, 1990.

SOURCE: U.S. Bureau of the Census, *The Foreigh Born Population in the United States*, CP-3-1 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce, July 1993), Tables 1, 3, 5; and data drawn from 5% Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) of the 1990 U.S. Census, subject to sample variability.

NOTE: The four figures for each nationality are absolute numbers of foreign-born persons from that nationality in 1990, followed by the percentage of adults who completed four years or more of college, the median household income in 1989 dollars, and the poverty rate.

Accorded in recent years only to legal refugee groups.

^bAccorded primarily to white immigrants.

^cExperienced primarily by nonwhite immigrants.

Foreigh-born groups of fewer than 100,000 not concentrated in a particular location.

Table 17
Political Orientations of Contemporary Immigrants

	Immigration Type				
Variable	Manual	Professionals	Entrepreneurial	Political	
	Laborers	and Technicians	Groups	Refugees	
Propensity to naturalize	low	medium	high	high	
Salience of politics	low	medium	medium	high	
Locus of early political concerns	external	mixed	mixed	external	
Character of ethnicity	reactive	linear	reactive	linear	

Alejandro Portes and Ruben Rumbaut, Immigrant America

SJVCRP Research Conducted in 2018

One of three research projects in which CVIIC has been involved in since 2017.

CVIIC conducted the field research.

Research coordinated by California Institute for Rural Studies (CIRS) and funded by San Joaquin Valley Health Fund.

Lead author, Ed Kissam.

Project interviewed over 600 people throughout the San Joaquin Valley.

Also organized 8 focus groups, various ethnicities.

Has produced 4 reports.

Research findings useful to develop 2 amicus briefs to oppose citizenship question.

Sites:

-https://www.shfcenter.org/San-Joaquin-Valley-Census-Research-Project

-https://CVIIC.org

Some Key Findings

Adding the citizenship question dramatically decreases willingness to participate in Census 2020.

Most survey respondents (84%) were willing to respond to a "simple" census without the citizenship question, but if the citizenship question were added, only 46% said they would be willing to participate

Latinos in Study:

Only 25% of **undocumented** said they would participate in a census with the citizenship question.

Legal resident response would drop from 85% to 63%.

Naturalized citizen participation would drop from 89% to 70%.

Second generation Latino participation would drop from 89% to 49%.

Some Challenges to Achieve Complete and Accurate Count

- •Some rural communities have no home mail delivery. U.S. Census Bureau does not deliver to P.O. boxes. Applies to 28% of respondents.
- •24% of Latino respondents lack internet access. While more than 90% of the respondents 25 years of age or younger had Internet access, less than 20% of the older respondents (65+) did.

- •22% of Latino respondents live in complex households multiple families under one roof.
- (37%) of the first-generation Latino immigrants have only an elementary school education and know only a little English or no English